



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/809,181	03/16/2001	Toshiya Satoh	503.39864X00	5733

20457 7590 10/08/2002

ANTONELLI TERRY STOUT AND KRAUS
SUITE 1800
1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET
ARLINGTON, VA 22209

EXAMINER

DIAZ, JOSE R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2815

DATE MAILED: 10/08/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/809,181

Applicant(s)

SATO ET AL.

Examiner

José R Díaz

Art Unit

2815

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 23 September 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: 1-10 and 28-36.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
10. ☐ Other: _____

EDDIE LEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Yamamoto does not teach the claimed limitations. However, the Examiner disagrees. Yamamoto, contrary to what Applicant states in the remarks, teaches such limitations in the Abstract and Figures 1-13. For example, Yamamoto, as acknowledged by Applicant on page 6 of the remarks, teaches the use of a polyimide layer 17 to mitigate the effects of the stress in semiconductor device (see also paragraphs [0010] and [0040] of Yamamoto), which agrees with the definition of the term "stress cushioning" used by Applicant to describe the layer 3. Further, Yamamoto teaches the use of a polyimide resin layer as the stress relieve layer 17 (see Abstract and paragraph [0013]), which fulfills the requirements disclosed by Applicant on page 24, lines 15-21. Thus, the layer 17 of Yamamoto is a "stress cushioning" layer since such a layer is formed of the same material, as disclosed in Applicant's Specification, and has the same claimed effect of mitigating the stress in the semiconductor device.

In addition, with regards to the cutting scribe lines, Applicant should note that Yamamoto also anticipates such a limitation. For example, and for the Applicant's convenience, Figure 13 of Yamamoto shows the cutting scribe lines (23) that separate each semiconductor device (24) (consider each square), wherein each semiconductor device include the stress cushioning layer (17), lead wire portion (14), conductive protective layer (10) and external electrodes (11), as described in the last Office action. Thus, the stress cushioning layer (17), lead wire portion (14), conductive protective layer (10) and external electrodes (11) of each semiconductor device (24) are inside of the square or cutting scribe lines (23), as required by Applicant.

Finally, Yamamoto states that his invention provides a "high reliable device" contrary to what Applicant argues in the remarks (see for example paragraphs [0010] and [0040] of Yamamoto). Therefore, Applicant arguments are not persuasive since Yamamoto anticipates the claimed limitations .